REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application.

New proposed corrected drawings have been submitted, and are believed to be in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84.

The specification has been amended to address the issue of the reference character "62" being used to designate both a second script and a first set of paragraphs. In addition, the second paragraph on page 5 has been amended to include reference to reference numerals 72-80.

The proposed amended drawings submitted herewith also address this error. Additionally, the specification has been amended to include the reference numerals 72-80 not mentioned in the specification, in accordance with 37 C.F.R § 1.84(p)(5). This amendment does not introduce any new matter because the reference numerals have been disclosed in Fig. 3.

Applicant has also amended the specification to correct informalities and typographical errors. These amendments have not introduced new matter into the disclosure.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 8, 11-12, 18, 21 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,721,416 to Farrell et al. After a careful review of the claims, and in view of the amendments to the claims, the rejections are therefore traversed and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include evaluating detected keywords in context to determine an information content of the key words in context. Farrell does not teach comparing the information content of the evaluated words with an information content of a plurality of expected customer responses and selecting the expected customer response with a closest relative match. Farrell only teaches comparing keywords.

In his rejection of claims 1 and 11, Examiner asserts that "key words are detected by the voice application (62) by searching the text for occurrences of words in the word table (64)(column 5, lines 38-40) . . . The voice application (62) selects text from the word table (64) that most closely matches the words or phrases spoken (column 5, lines 38-40)." This does not

address whether Farrell teaches comparing the information content of the keywords in context. The cited portion of Farrell teaches comparing just keywords: "The voice application 62 searches the text for occurrences of words or phrases in the word table 64 and acquires a score for any hits (step 204)." (Col. 5, lines 38-40 of Farrell). The word table 64 of Farrell contains only text of confrontational statements, and text of non-confrontational counter-phrases. (See Col. 4, lines 41-65 of Farrell). This table does not contain any information content of keywords in context. Thus, Farrell fails to teach comparing the information content of evaluated keywords, and therefore it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of claims 1 and 11.

Regarding claim 21, Farrell fails to teach a parsing processor, an information content processor, or an information comparator. The Examiner asserts, "the parsing processor, information content processor and information comparator are all based on IBM's Voice Response for Windows (Column 3, lines 45-59)". The cited portion of Farrell does not teach the use of a parsing processor, an information content processor, or an information comparator. Rather, Farrell discloses only keyword processing as opposed to information processing. Further, Farrell does not disclose a comparator adapted to compare the information content of evaluated keywords in context. Farrell fails to teach the limitation of an information comparator, and therefore the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of claim 21.

As to Claim 26, Farrell does not teach detecting key words in context of the response, evaluating the detected key words in context to determine an information content, comparing the information content of the evaluated words with an information content of each of a plurality of expected customer response, and selecting the expected customer response with a closest relative match for presentation to the customer. Furthermore, based on the same arguments as presented for claims 1 and 11, Applicant believes claim 26 to be allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9-10, 19-20 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell. Regarding claims 9, 10, 19, 20 and 25, the claims depend on allowable

base claims, and add additional, novel subject matter of the invention. For this reason, Applicant's claims 9, 10, 19, 20 and 25 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-5, 13-15 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,567,787 to Walker et al.

Regarding claims 5 and 15, Applicant claims changing the first portion of the script when the performance level exceeds a threshold level. For example, if an agent is consistently successful, this permits the system to recognize the effective techniques used by that agent and prompt other, less-efficient agents to respond like the efficient agent. Page 11, line 31 to page 12, line 4 of the specification describes an example of this process in more detail:

> Where it is determined that the selected agent 20, 26 is consistently successful, the detected differences may be incorporated into script presented to all of the agents 20, 26. In order to incorporate subtleties such as pitch and word rate, parenthetical instructions may be inserted into the text to prompt the agent 20, 26 to follow successful techniques used by others.

Neither Farrell nor Walker teaches changing the first portion of script when the performance level exceeds a threshold level. Rather, Walker discloses a method for adapting scripts for less-skilled agents that cannot deliver complex verbal messages, in other words, for low performing agents. (Column 6, lines 11-23 of Walker). This does not teach changing the script in response to high performance of an agent, for example, modifying the script according to the techniques of a successful telemarketer. Therefore claims 5 and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Regarding claims 2-4, 6-8, 12-14, 16-18, 22 and 24, the claims depend on allowable base claims and also include additional, novel subject matter of the invention. Therefore these claims should be allowed.

11

Allowance of claims 1-26, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

September 7, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500